

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-22 stand rejected. Herein, no Claim has been amended. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 1-22 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) Rejections

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lord et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2003/0028514 (hereafter Lord). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites:

A method of providing shared objects and node-specific objects in a cluster file system, said method comprising:

providing to a particular **shared object** an attribute that indicates any object created in said particular shared object from this point in time will be designated **as node-specific**; and

when a node causes a file system operation that is node-specific to be performed by accessing said particular shared object, performing said file system operation in an alternate directory corresponding to said node, wherein said alternate directory supports a node-specific object. (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that Lord does not disclose the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 1 recites the limitation, "providing to a particular **shared object** an attribute that indicates any object created in said particular shared object from this point in time will be

designated ***as node-specific***," (emphasis added). In contrast, Lord fails to disclose shared objects and node-specific objects and the distinction between shared and node-specific. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by Lord and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-7 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over Lord. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-7 are patentable over Lord for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 8 and 15, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 8 and 15 have similar limitations as Independent Claim 1. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 8 and 15 are patentable over Lord for the reasons discussed with respect to Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 9-14 and Dependent Claims 16-22 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 8 and 15, respectfully, which are allowable over Lord. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 9-14 and Dependent Claims 16-22 are patentable over Lord for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments and remarks overcome all rejections and objections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-22) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-22) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 12/29/2008


Anthony C. Murabito
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060